



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

I have a certain sympathy with DITTMAR, as I tried to show in my too brief mention of his *Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre* (A. J. P. XX 113). The emotional side of the moods has not been sufficiently emphasized and so far I am in accord with him, but the emotions cool in passing through the medium of speech, if we dare not use λόγος of the early time. Pure emotion is inarticulate and does not fall within the sphere of language proper. It is well enough to imagine the indicative as a pool of Bethesda, which is moved by the spirit of strife into subjunctive, subjective and polemic ripples, but how are we to measure the ripples? Surely Herr DITTMAR takes himself too seriously when in one of his recent outgivings he says: Der Konjunktiv <weist> auf die seelische Depression des Sprechers hin, der Acc. c. inf. auf die seelische Extase, der Indikativ auf die seelische Ataraxie. Diese drei Modi stehen im engsten Zusammenhang mit der Wirklichkeit und der realen Welt der Dinge. Ihnen steht gegenüber der Optativ welcher uns aus der Welt des Seins in die des Scheins, aus dem Reiche der Realität in das Gebiet der die Fesseln des Raumes und der Zeit, der Kausalität und Realität sprengenden Phantasie führt. Damit ist ein fester Boden gegeben auf dem weiter gebaut werden kann (Berliner Phil. Woch. 22 März 1902). 'Fester Boden' seems to me a strange term for the troubled sea of emotion; and, what is more, the psychic state of the speaker will not help us to reproduce the phenomena. The ἀραξία of the utterance does not necessarily reflect the ἀραξία of the utterer. The indicative in certain constructions produces the undeniable effect of grimness and grimness is a false ἀραξία. Nothing can be more illuminating than a survey of the constructions of the verbs of emotion, constructions which show the reciprocal play of heart and brain, but these are things that are not to be mastered by the simple process of phrase-making. He who wishes to see the beauty of the Queen we call Language must stand where Gyges stood and gaze as Gyges gazed.

Apart then from the eloquence there seems to be little new in the practical outcome of DITTMAR's programme. Other grammarians have called the indicative the mood of quiet assertion; the dubitative subjunctive, the subjunctive of fear and dread, of apprehension and embarrassment, is not a stranger, even if we have not learned to call it the mood of depression; and the optative

mood is still the ideal mood, the mood of the fancy. The accusative with the infinitive is nothing but the object effected, the thing generated, and like all generation demands the forthputting of energy, ecstatic energy, if one chooses. No one who has served an apprenticeship on a political newspaper as a flyer of editorial kites, as a manufacturer of nicknames, will be much impressed by the interminable terminology that is invading the grammatical domain; and I am disposed to do penance for my humble part in enlarging that nomenclature. There are hosts of phrases that might be used with some color of propriety. Why not call the indicative the mood of sapience? Sapience involves *ἀταραξία*. Why not call the unreal indicative the mood of resipiscence to match the imperfect of expergefaction, the imperfect with *ἄρα*? Or we might call the optative the mood of illusion and then the unreal indicative would fitly be the mood of disillusion. Why not? But I forbear. In a recent number of the *Journal* I made light of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Benjamin, the prophet (A. J. P. XXIII 1, note), but I must confess that I too am beginning to dread lest we grammarians become 'chimaerae bombinantes in vacuo' and that vacuum the classroom; I too am beginning to dread lest what the late epigram says of the rhetorician prove true of the grammarian:

Χαίρετ', Ἀριστείδου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἐπὶ μαθηταί,
τέσσαρες οἱ τοῖχοι καὶ τρία συνψέλια

which some rhymester, emulous of Mrs. Browning's consonances, has imitated thus:

I'm a success, sir, I'm a success, sir,
Seven steady students are at each lecture,
Four walls and three desks, sir.

Il. 19, 92-3 we read:

τῇ μὲν θ' ἀπαλοὶ πόδες, οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' οὐδὲι
πίλναται, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἢ γε κατ' ἀνδρῶν κράατα βαίνει.

In Plato's *Symposium* 195 D Agathon presents the following variants. For *τῇ* (Aristarchos) he has *τῆς*, and for *ἐπ' οὐδὲι* he has *ἐπ' οὐδεος* and, as Stobaeus in quoting Plato (*Floril.* LXIII 36) quotes *τῆς* and *οὐδεος*, we may well acquiesce in the Platonic text. Now superstition about the authority of quotations as against the received text has long been exploded. Everything depends on the quoter. A pedantic grammarian who believed in verifying references might be considered seriously; but the healthy ancient like the healthy modern quoted from memory and memory is tricky. Every now and then some newspaper article sets the masses right, but on they go again using French that is anything but French, misquoting Shakespeare and the Bible, chief of all,

murdering the author of *Hudibras*, twisting Pope. An amusing list of inexactitudes in the way of quotation may be found in Ezra Abbot's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*; and Dean Farrar's singularly comprehensive and singularly inaccurate memory was shown up by Mr. Jeans in the *Classical Review* V (1891) 279. As for the specimen on hand I cannot agree with Professor HOWES (*Harvard Studies* VI 201), in thinking that 'Plato may well be preserving an old tradition in the form *οὐδεος*'. There is absolutely no warrant for *οὐδεος*. As for *τῆς*, which according to Professor HOWES has only the authority of the scholion Ven. A, and we might add the Genevese scholion, Ludwich says that most of the MSS of Homer have *τῆς*, the smaller number *τῇ* with Aristarchos.

Now we all know Plato's naughty ways with poetry, how prone he is to fit his poetical quotations to the body of his work by prose flanges, so to speak; how he turns the order topsy-turvy to the befoolment of such amateurs as Mr. Pater (*A. J. P.* XV 93), how he plays with the diction of the original, 'like a sunbeam that has lost its way on an old wall', to quote M. Taine's pretty words about Shakespeare. In the passage before us the epic vocabulary is kept, but it looks to me very much as if Plato had put the preferentially prose syntax for the preferentially poetic syntax. In prose, parts of the body as parts of the body, take the genitive, and when the grammarian Lesbonax wished to present an extravagant form of the *σχῆμα Κολοφώνιον*, he manufactured *ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ* which corresponds to the negro French 'tête à l'homme', and the example is certainly deterrent (*A. J. P.* XXIII 22). How steady the use is, it may be well to bring to the consciousness, especially as it is distinctly partitive. The dative gives a different turn. See my note on Pind. O. 6, 5. On these diamonds of speech pivot the wheels of poetry. How many generations of men repeated 'facilis descensus Avernī'. Who would put 'Avernī' back now instead of the semipersonalizing dative? 'Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming'. And finally, as between *ἐνί* with the dative and *ἐπί* with the genitive, the dative is more poetic (*A. J. P.* XVIII 119), and so we find in Δ 443: *ἐνὶ χθονὶ βαίνει*.

In the preface to his annotated edition of *Homer's Odyssey*, Books XIII-XXIV (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press), Mr. MONRO says that the volume is designed as a continuation of the commentary on the *Odyssey* begun more than twenty-five years ago by Dr. RIDDELL and completed by Dr. MERRY. The second edition of the Riddell-Merry book appeared in 1885 and after another long interval during which Homeric studies have not

stood still, the Riddell-Merry-Monro *τρικάριος Ὀδύσσεια* is there with its twenty-four books. To form a just judgment of Mr. MONRO'S continuation, it would be necessary to study the limitations of the task, to examine how far the work of Mr. MONRO'S predecessors has anticipated him or haply has hampered him, but we are only too glad to welcome any contribution that so eminent an Homeric scholar, as Mr. MONRO is, chooses to make to our stock of knowledge. The truth about the edition, as about so many editions by specialists, is that the editor does not condescend to men of low estate and that the points that he touches are only such as interest himself. Of course, in a work addressed to scholars, not schoolboys, we do not expect trivialities, but Homeric research has been so active that only Homeric specialists can hope to be perfectly up-to-date; and what Mr. MONRO gives us in his notes deals largely with his present views of moot points. References to the editor's admirable Homeric Grammar form the stock of his grammatical explanations and therefore there is little new in that line. When a professed grammarian writes a commentary, he is naturally more alive to all the phenomena that he has registered in his grammar than the ordinary editor would be, and the observations already made are apt to absorb his attention. Of especial interest are the appended essays, which have to do with such important problems as the Composition of the Odyssey, the Relation of the Odyssey to the Iliad, Homer and the Cyclic Poets—a favorite domain of Mr. MONRO'S—the Time and Place of Homer and the Homeric House. As I have said before, the delight of being an Homeric scholar has the terrible drawback of the necessity of taking up a definite position on these much debated questions. No sooner do we yield to Reichel than we are roused from our supineness by Robert, and no sooner do we rebuild the palace of Odysseus than the latest news from Knossos makes us reconsider our plans. That Mr. MONRO has gone into the mellay of Homeric controversy reluctantly is fairly evident from his preface, and we are all the more grateful to him for his clear and succinct account of modern research, because we appreciate the sacrifice he has made.

One day I was making my moan to my old fellow-student, Professor WHITNEY, about my hopeless quest of typographical impeccability. The higher the standard, the flatter the failure. But small comfort did I receive from that careful scholar, who professed that he himself had withstood all the assaults of the printer's devil, that adversary of the philological soul, on whom the philological soul often unloads more than is his due. I listened and waited and not in vain. A few months after our talk, the printer had found the heel of the invulnerable Achilles. A leaf had lighted on the back of 'der gehörnte Siegfried' of philology.

The types had put 'older' for 'other' and made inerrant WHITNEY responsible for a sad heresy (see A. J. P. XIV 138). For my own part, nothing reconciles me to a typographical error. I admire but I cannot emulate the temper of the fine old Athenian gentlemen described by Aristophanes,

εἰ δέ που πέσοιεν ἐς τὸν ὄμον ἐν μάχῃ τινί,
τοῦτ' ἀπεψήσαντ' ἄν, εἴτ' ἡρνοῦντο μὴ πεπτωκέναι,

and find myself intoning the tragic lament:

χωρεῖ πρὸς ἥπαρ γενναία δύη.

From this preamble it will readily be divined that I am in trouble again. Not only does the last number of the Journal show here and there typographical slips of an elementary sort, which the benevolent reader will correct without further ado and the malevolent reader will point at with scorn, but I find myself committed to a sentence which is exactly the reverse of what I intended to write, a blunder which is mine alone. On p. 108 l. 22 from bottom read 'I should not proceed to reverse the old tenet which represents the genitive as *dependent on the nominal element of the verb rather than on the verbal element of the noun*'. Compare the foot-note of the same number, p. 22. As I have already said, the early relations of Indo-Germanic lie beyond the range of my speculations. All that I try to make out is the Greek conception. Paul says that adnominal and adverbial genitive have distinct functions in Indo-Germanic, *a fortiori* in Greek. Are they parallel in the Greek mind, or which is subordinate to which? To me it does not seem that the predominance of the adnominal genitive has been overthrown, and I am interested to see that Delbrück's contention that the adverbial genitive was the older is not yielded by the latest investigator VAN WIJK, who, by the way, following the lead of STREITBERG, maintains in a dissertation just published at Zwolle, *Der nominale Genetiv Singular im Indogermanischen*, that the genitive singular in Indo-Germanic is originally identical with the nominative, σκωπός, for instance, differing in the last analysis from σκῶψ (*skēp-es) only in the matter of accent. This view helps us to understand the adnominal genitive, the function of which is to form temporary compounds with the noun, but VAN WIJK's explanation of the adverbial genitive on the same basis seems to halt. But of this more hereafter.